

**CITY OF KENMORE
WASHINGTON
RESOLUTION NO. 13-217**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF KENMORE, WASHINGTON,
ADOPTING A SIDEWALK PROGRAM AND DIRECTING THE CITY
MANAGER TO IMPLEMENT SAID PROGRAM**

WHEREAS, the City Council adopted a goal to "Establish a 20- to 30-Year Sidewalk Plan" on January 21, 2012; and

WHEREAS, City Staff prepared a sidewalk program and distributed the final draft to City Council for review and comment at the December 3, 2012, Council meeting; and

WHEREAS, City staff presented the final draft sidewalk program to City Council at the April 15, 2013, Council meeting and received Council comments for consideration; and

WHEREAS, City staff made revisions to the sidewalk program on May 17, 2013, based on Council feedback; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has considered the proposed Sidewalk Program and desires to adopt the same;

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF KENMORE, WASHINGTON, DOES RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Adoption. The City Council hereby approves and adopts the Kenmore Sidewalk Program as set forth in Exhibit A, attached hereto and incorporated by reference.

Section 2. Implementing Plan. The City Council hereby authorizes and directs the City Manager or his/her designee to implement the Sidewalk Program and bring back to Council all ordinances necessary to incorporate said program into the City's Capital Improvement Program.

PASSED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF KENMORE, WASHINGTON, AT A REGULAR MEETING THEREOF THIS 28th DAY OF May, 2013.

CITY OF KENMORE



Mayor David Baker

ATTEST/AUTHENTICATED:



Patty Safrin, City Clerk



City Of Kenmore, Washington

Memorandum

Date: November 30, 2012
 (Revised May 17, 2013)
 (Revised Attachment B per Council Direction May 28, 2013)

To: Rob Karlinsey, City Manager

From: Kent Vaughan, Senior Civil Engineer
 Kris Overleese, City Engineer

Subject: City Sidewalk Program

In 2012, City Council developed a goal to ***Establish a 20 - 30 Year Sidewalk Plan***. To create this plan, staff utilized previously compiled missing sidewalk segments and evaluated the missing sidewalk segments utilizing criteria. Working towards Council's goal, staff recommends a six-year project list horizon that matches the Capital Improvement Program. The Sidewalk Plan list of projects would be revisited every two years during the budget and capital improvement program adoption process.

Attached are six documents that comprise the City's Sidewalk Program:

- 1) Attachment A: Sidewalk Priority Criteria developed by staff based on the City's Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element;
- 2) Attachment B: A matrix listing arterial street segments, staff's priority rankings based on the Priority Criteria, and a planning level cost estimate to construct sidewalk on one side of the street;
- 3) Attachment C: Unit Cost Estimate Scenarios A, B, and C based on existing field conditions;
- 4) Attachment D: Federal, State, and Local Funding Sources;
- 5) Attachment E: Six year sidewalk implementation plan;
- 6) Attachment F: Vicinity Map of proposed sidewalk projects.

Sidewalk Policy Direction

The City's policy direction to provide for sidewalks can be found in the Comprehensive Plan, more specifically ***Comprehensive Plan Goal T-7: "Establish a Non-Motorized Circulation System Linking Key Community Destinations."***

This Goal is found in the Transportation Element Chapter. It establishes the importance of creating sidewalk and trail networks linking neighborhoods, the Downtown, and community destinations. Policy T-7.1.1 establishes arterial sidewalk installation as the top priority. The preferred pedestrian improvement is curb & gutter and minimum 5-foot sidewalk with landscaped buffer. City's Street Standards require a minimum 6.5-foot



City Of Kenmore, Washington

Memorandum

wide sidewalk on arterial streets when the curb is next to the traveled lane. To be conservative, and reduce the possible need to acquire right-of-way, the planning level cost estimates were developed for 6.5 foot wide sidewalks placed directly behind the curb to reduce the sidewalk footprint.

Sidewalk Priority Criteria

Attachment A, Sidewalk Priority Criteria, were developed utilizing the guidance in the Comprehensive Plan within goal T-7 above. The sidewalk priority criteria are listed below:

- Pedestrian safety;
- Connection with community facilities and commercial centers;
- Continuity (filling missing links);
- Connection with transit routes and facilities;
- Proximity to schools;
- Public support.

These criteria were utilized to compare the arterials in Kenmore that do not have sidewalks. The resulting comparison lists sidewalk segments and how they rate given the criteria and is listed in Attachment B: Sidewalk Matrix Scoring.

Sidewalk Matrix Scoring

The Sidewalk Matrix lists the arterial segments within the City, each segment's score based on the Sidewalk Criteria, and planning level estimates of probable cost. Two of the ranking criteria most critical to grant success were weighted by a factor of 2: Proximity to schools and Continuity. Staff recommends that the sidewalk rankings be used as a tool in selecting segments to pursue funding, but should not be set in stone. Over time, things change and needs change. Staff believes that Council should have the flexibility to choose sidewalk projects as they see fit provided the projects would score favorably for funding.

Sidewalk Unit Costs

A planning level estimate of probable cost is not based on design plans. It is an estimated linear foot cost of sidewalk applied to a length of segment (linear foot cost x linear feet of sidewalk = estimated cost). The planning level estimate of probable cost includes survey, design, construction and construction management. It is assumed that the sidewalk improvements can be constructed entirely within public right of way. The linear foot cost for installing sidewalk often seems high. Sidewalk projects are often challenging for the several reasons:



City Of Kenmore, Washington

Memorandum

- 1) There are many unknowns and limited information available when determining the project costs. There are no field surveys or designs to reference and many assumptions are made to develop the estimates, which result in high contingencies.
- 2) Staff aims to install the sidewalk in the "future" location based on the City's long term vision for the roadway. This often requires road widening. If hilly terrain conditions exist, retaining walls are often needed to cut into a hillside or fill where the right of way drops off.
- 3) Installations of curb/gutter/sidewalk generate new impervious surfaces that require storm water systems to satisfy newer development standards.
- 4) Utilities: power poles exist on roadway shoulders. When power poles require relocation above ground in public right-of-way, utilities bear the cost. However, in the downtown area, utility undergrounding is desired and the City must share this cost with the utilities. Utility undergrounding costs were not included in the planning level unit cost estimates.

Planning level unit costs were developed for three field condition scenarios shown in Attachment C. The scenarios are as follows: A) arterial streets where only shoulder exists (\$700 per linear foot); B) arterial streets where shoulder and storm drainage exist (\$500 per linear foot) and C) arterial streets where curb & gutter and storm drainage exist (\$400 per linear foot). The most common scenario in Kenmore is Scenario B where shoulder and storm drainage exist (\$500 per linear foot). Each linear foot estimate includes a 50% contingency and 40% mark-up to cover administration costs (15% design, 15% construction administration, 10% staff costs). Where more accurate linear foot cost data was available, it was used. For instance, the 68th Avenue NE Sidewalks Pre-design Study was completed in 2008 and provides linear foot costs exceeding the planning level estimates. This was mostly attributable to the need to build retaining walls along the alignment.

Sidewalk Program Funding

Policy T-7.1.5 establishes a variety of implementation strategies to complete the arterial and local sidewalk system. One of these strategies is to aggressively pursue grant funding for improvements. Given the City's limited resources, Staff has developed the City's sidewalk program and short term 2013-2018 implementation plan around this strategy. Projects that were included in the short term implementation list scored high in the rankings matrix, but also would score high in staff's opinion on grant applications.

When reviewing the Sidewalk Matrix rankings, the bottom line cost to construct sidewalk on arterial streets on one side of the road only is \$36 Million dollars. If these projects were addressed in a 20 year time frame, the City would need to allocate almost \$2 Million in sidewalk investment per year. Currently the City has been setting aside a little more than \$100,000 per year for sidewalks. Staff recommends continuing this strategy



City Of Kenmore, Washington

Memorandum

and use the money as grant matching funds for sidewalk projects to leverage the City's return on investment. Generally the program would strive to build one sidewalk project a year where the City's contribution would be less than \$100,000 (roughly 30%). With this strategy and successful grant applications, the City could complete roughly \$6.6M in sidewalk projects over the next 20 years. Projects ranking high in the matrix but with a high price tag (such as the 68th Avenue NE Sidewalk segments) would be pursued when enough match money has accumulated in the sidewalk program. Another option would be to utilize reserves to provide match up front and allow the Sidewalk Program funds to re-accumulate. This would result in a year (or possibly two) where no sidewalk projects are built in the City.

Funding Sources

Federal, State and Local funding sources and their descriptions are provided in Attachment D. Historically, the most viable grant funding sources have been the WSDOT Pedestrian and Bicycle Program, WSDOT Safe Route to Schools, Transportation Improvement Board Sidewalk Program, and King County Community Development Block Grants. The Community Economic Revitalization Board (CERB) grant was not included in the program because its funding is not sustained. CERB has indicated that there is the possibility that they will release another call for projects in 2013. If this occurs, staff will submit another grant application for the NE 181st Street sidewalk segment. For the short term sidewalk implementation plan, it was assumed that the City would provide 25% in matching funds and 5% for upfront grant preparation and staff costs.

Public Involvement

To date there has been no specific public meetings on the development of this sidewalk plan. Several public open houses were held in past years voicing support for two of the projects listed: **T 27-4 West Side of 68th Ave/202nd ST from 198th ST to 66th Ave** and **T-27-5 West Side of Arrowhead Drive from 64th Ave to 151st ST**. Of the other three projects listed, **T 27-1 East Side of 68th Ave NE from 182nd to 185th ST** has been successfully funded with a TIB grant in 2012, **T 27-2 North Side of 155th ST from 84th to 86th Ave** has a pending WSDOT Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety grant submitted in 2012 (results to be revealed in 2013) and is a continuation of the NE 155th ST sidewalk project constructed in 2002, and **T 27-3 South Side of 181st ST from 68th to 73rd Ave** is a continuation of the NE 181st ST sidewalk improvements constructed in 2007 as part of the SR522 Phase 1 Stage 1 project. Future public input opportunities will be available in the next budget biennium when the Sidewalk Program is revisited.

Summary

Staff recommends a six-year project list horizon that matches the Capital Improvement Program. As mentioned, Staff recommends re-visiting the list with Capital Improvement



City Of Kenmore, Washington

Memorandum

Program (CIP) updates. See Attachment E for six year planning horizon and Attachment F for vicinity map of projects in years one through six.

Attachment A

Sidewalk Priority Criteria

City of Kenmore, Washington

The improvement prioritization process ranks potential sidewalk projects based on the Comprehensive Plan sidewalk priorities, T-7.1.1 and T-7.1.2, and other appropriate measures. The criteria include pedestrian safety; connection to services and facilities; completion of links in the system; connection to transit; proximity to a school and public support. Because the Comprehensive Plan Policy T-7.1.1 requires sidewalks on Arterials to be the highest priority, only arterial streets were prioritized. The six criteria are described below:

1. Pedestrian Safety Policy T-7.1.2.b.1

Description: Will the improvement increase pedestrian safety?

Does this improvement:

- Separate pedestrians from vehicular traffic, especially in high traffic areas?
- Improve width of sidewalk and surface conditions?
- Address potential conflicts at street crossings?

Points: 3 = High concern for pedestrian safety along this route due to vehicle speeds and walking conditions.

2 = Moderate concern for pedestrian safety along this route due to vehicle speeds and walking conditions.

1 = Low concern for pedestrian safety.

2. Connectivity with Community Facilities and Commercial Centers Policy T – 7.1.2.b.1

Description: Does this route connect to community facilities or commercial centers?

Does this improvement:

- Provide direct access to facilities or services?
- Ensure that the route links to a safe direct access to facilities or services?

Points: 3 = Route provides access to frequently used community facilities and commercial centers.

2 = Route provides access to moderately used community facilities and commercial centers.

1 = Route provides access to infrequently used community facilities or commercial centers.

3. Continuity – Link Policy T – 7.1.2.b.1

Description: Does this route complete gaps in the City's walkway system?

Does this improvement:

- Complete important pedestrian routes?
- Make important destinations more accessible to users?
- Ultimately develop a web of walkways?

Points: 6 = Route links to sidewalk and is 350 feet or less in length.

4 = Route links to sidewalk and is between 350 feet and 650 feet in length.

2 = Route links to sidewalk is over 650 feet in length.

4. Connectivity to transit routes and facilities Policy T – 7.1.2.b.2

Description: Is this route also a route for transit or provide access to transit?

Points: 3 = Route is on a public transit route with transit stops.

2 = Route is within 650 feet from a public transit route with transit stops.

1 = Route provides access to public transit where sidewalks do not exist on adjacent pedestrian routes (beyond 650 feet from a public transit route).

5. Proximity to Schools

Description: Is this route within a mile of a public school?

Does this improvement:

- Provide access to a public school?
- Provide a safe route for schoolchildren to and from school?
- Serve elementary schools?

Points: 6 = Route is a designated elementary school route.

4 = Route is commonly used by walking students.

2 = Route is within a half mile of school.

6. Public Support

Description: Does the public support the development of this route?

Points: 3 = Route has been supported by a petition filed with a large number of signatures from abutting and nearby property owners and the general public.

2 = Route has been the subject of a number of citizen comments at public meetings.

1 = Route has been the subject of some concern at public meetings.

idewalk Project Ranking - Sorted

Segments selected to six year sidewalk implementation plan

Based on 68th Sidewalk Study cost estimate, June 2008 (includes retaining walls along alignment).

Arrowhead Drive is not an arterial segment, but was previously identified as a citizen hot spot; possible candidate for "safe route to schools" grant project.

Voted Regionally Significant Segment by City Council (May 28, 2013)

Regionally Significant Segment by City Council (May 28, 2013) **

Pedestrian Safety	Proximity to Schools	Connectivity with Community Facilities and Commercial Centers	Connectivity to Transit Routes & Facilities	Continuity-Link	Public Support	Total Points	Existing Conditions	Unit Cost	Estimated Total Cost				
NE 202nd ST	62nd Ave NE	66th Ave NE	1850	3	6	2	3	2	2	18	B	\$900	\$1,665,000
NE 202nd ST	66th Ave NE	NE 198th ST	900	3	6	2	3	2	2	18	B	\$800	\$720,000
NE 155th ST	84TH AVE	86TH AVE	508	3	4	2	3	4	1	17	B	\$500	\$254,000
68th Ave NE	NE 187TH ST	NE 185TH ST	464	3	4	3	3	2	2	17	A	\$1,100	\$510,400
68th Ave NE	NE 182ND ST	NE 185TH ST	466	3	4	3	3	2	2	17	B	\$500	\$233,400
68th Ave NE	NE 198TH ST	NE 195TH ST	1192	3	4	2	3	2	2	16	A	\$1,100	\$1,311,200
68th Ave NE	NE 195TH ST	NE 191ST ST	1236	3	4	2	3	2	2	16	A	\$1,100	\$1,359,600
68th Ave NE	NE 191ST ST	NE 190TH ST	120	3	4	2	3	2	2	16	A	\$1,100	\$132,000
68th Ave NE	NE 190TH ST	NE 187TH ST	884	3	4	2	3	2	2	16	A	\$1,100	\$972,400
NE 192nd ST	73RD AVE	NE 192nd ST	626	3	4	2	0	6	1	16	A	\$700	\$438,200
NE 192nd ST	75TH AVE	80TH AVE	1637	3	4	2	0	6	1	16	A	\$700	\$1,145,900
Arrowhead Drive	64th Ave NE	NE 151st ST	1,000	3	6	2	2	0	3	16	B	\$500	\$500,000
62nd Ave NE	61st Ave NE	NE 202nd ST	300	3	4	2	3	2	2	16	B	\$900	\$270,000
NE 181st ST	East of 68th	73RD AVE	658	3	0	3	2	6	2	16	B	\$500	\$329,000
NE 181st ST	65TH AVE	67TH AVE	462	3	0	2	3	6	1	15	A	\$700	\$323,400
Juanita DR NE	NE 154TH CT	NE 153RD PL	651	3	6	2	3	0	1	15	B	\$500	\$325,500
Juanita DR NE	NE 153RD PL	NE 149 ST	1281	3	6	2	3	0	1	15	B	\$500	\$640,500
Juanita DR NE	NE 155TH PL	NE 154TH CT	645	2	6	2	3	0	1	14	B	\$500	\$322,500
84th Ave NE	NE 153RD ST	NE 155TH	586	2	6	1	3	0	1	13	A	\$700	\$410,200
NE 153 ST	NE 153 ST	NE 150TH	563	2	6	1	3	0	1	13	A	\$700	\$394,100
65th Ave NE	NE 181ST	BOTHELL WAY NE	304	2	0	3	2	6	0	13	C	\$400	\$121,600

Pedestrian Safety		Proximity to Schools		Connectivity with Community Facilities and Commercial Centers		Connectivity to Transit Routes & Facilities		Continuity-Link		Public Support		Total Points		Existing Conditions		Unit Cost		Estimated Total Cost	
NE 181st ST	64TH AVE NE	65TH AVE NE	709	3	0	2	3	0	1	9	A	\$700					\$496,300		
61st Ave NE	60TH AVE NE	NE 181ST ST	1717	3	0	2	3	0	1	9	C	\$400					\$686,800		
80th Ave NE	NE 190TH	NE 185TH	1300	3	0	0	1	4	1	9	B	\$500					\$650,000		
80th Ave NE	NE 185TH	NE 183RD	460	3	0	0	1	4	1	9	B	\$500					\$230,000		
80th Ave NE	NE 183RD	NE 179TH LN\PL	998	3	0	0	1	4	1	9	B	\$500					\$499,000		
61st Ave NE	NE 193RD ST	NE 190TH ST	439	3	0	1	3	0	1	8	C	\$400					\$175,600		
61st Ave NE	NE 190TH ST	60TH AVE NE	959	3	0	1	3	0	1	8	C	\$400					\$383,600		
61st PI NE	CITY LIMITS	62ND AVE	194	3	0	1	3	0	1	8	C	\$400					\$77,600		
61st PI NE	62ND AVE NE	NE 200TH ST	1158	3	0	1	3	0	1	8	C	\$400					\$463,200		
61st PI NE	NE 200TH ST	NE 197TH ST	531	3	0	1	3	0	1	8	C	\$400					\$212,400		
61st PI NE	NE 197TH	60TH AV NE	589	3	0	1	3	0	1	8	C	\$400					\$235,600		
61st Ave NE	60TH AVE NE	NE 195 PL	795	3	0	1	3	0	1	8	C	\$400					\$318,000		
61st Ave NE	NE 195TH PL	NE 194TH PL	277	3	0	1	3	0	1	8	C	\$400					\$110,800		
61st Ave NE	NE 194TH PL	NE 192RD PL	190	3	0	1	3	0	1	8	C	\$400					\$76,000		
61st Ave NE	NE 193RD PL	NE 193RD ST	169	3	0	1	3	0	1	8	C	\$400					\$67,600		
NE 170th ST	JUANITA DR NE	70TH AVE NE	742	2	0	2	3	0	1	8	B	\$500					\$371,000		
73rd Ave NE	NE 204TH	NE 204TH	85	2	2	1	0	2	0	7	B	\$500					\$42,500		
73rd Ave NE	NE 204TH	NE 202ND	427	2	2	1	0	2	0	7	B	\$500					\$213,500		
73rd Ave NE	NE 202ND	NE 192ND	2514	2	2	1	0	2	0	7	B	\$500					\$1,257,000		
80th Ave NE	NE 205TH ST / City Limits	NE 203 ST	682	3	0	0	1	2	1	7	A	\$700					\$477,400		
80th Ave NE	NE 203 ST	NE 195 ST	1953	3	0	0	1	2	1	7	A	\$700					\$1,367,100		
NE 170th ST	70TH AVE NE	72ND AVE NE	568	2	0	2	1	0	1	6	B	\$500					\$284,000		
NE 170th ST	72ND AVE NE	75TH AVE NE	1016	2	0	2	1	0	1	6	B	\$500					\$508,000		
NE 170th ST	75TH AVE	79TH PL N	1213	2	0	2	1	0	1	6	B	\$500					\$606,500		
83rd PL NE	Bothell WAY NE	82nd Ave NE	500	2	0	1	1	2	0	6	B	\$500					\$250,000		
73rd Ave NE	CITY LIMITS	NE 204TH	227	2	0	1	0	2	0	5	B	\$500					\$113,500		
Simonds Rd NE	79TH PL N	NE 169TH	539	2	0	1	1	0	1	5	B	\$500					\$269,500		
Simonds Rd NE	NE 169TH	NE 166TH	729	2	0	1	1	0	1	5	B	\$500					\$364,500		
Simonds Rd NE	NE 166TH	NE 165TH	257	2	0	1	1	0	1	5	B	\$500					\$128,500		
Simonds Rd NE	NE 165TH	NE 162ND	229	2	0	1	1	0	1	5	B	\$500					\$114,500		
Simonds Rd NE	NE 162nd PL	NE 162nd CT	289	2	0	1	1	0	1	5	B	\$500					\$144,500		

	Pedestrian Safety	Proximity to Schools	Connectivity with Community Facilities and Commercial Centers	Connectivity to Transit Routes & Facilities	Continuity-Link	Public Support	Total Points	Existing Conditions	Unit Cost	Estimated Total Cost				
704	Simonds Rd NE	NE 162ND	84TH AVE	2	0	1	1	1	0	1	5	B	\$500	\$352,000
1203	Simonds Rd NE	84TH AVE	NE 157TH	2	0	1	1	1	0	1	5	B	\$500	\$601,500
571	Simonds Rd NE	88TH AVE	NE 152ND	2	0	1	1	1	0	1	5	B	\$500	\$285,500
970	Simonds Rd NE	NE 152ND	NE 151ST	2	0	1	1	1	0	1	5	B	\$500	\$485,000
737	Simonds Rd NE	NE 151ST	NE 147TH	2	0	1	1	1	0	1	5	B	\$500	\$368,500
500	NE 193rd ST	55th AVE NE	61st AVE NE	2	0	0	1	1	2	0	5	B	\$500	\$250,000
577	84th Ave NE	SIMONDS R	NE 159TH	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	A	\$700	\$403,900
280	84th Ave NE	NE 159 ST	NE 158 ST	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	A	\$700	\$196,000
272	84th Ave NE	NE 158 ST	NE 156 ST (PRIVATE)	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	A	\$700	\$190,400
529	84th Ave NE	NE 156TH	NE 155TH	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	A	\$700	\$370,300
Arterial Total (Rounded):										\$36,000,000				

Attachment C

City of Kenmore Sidewalk Program

Engineer's Estimate of Probable Construction Costs

Sidewalk Improvements (For 200 LF Increments)

ITEM NO.	ITEM	UNIT	UNIT PRICE	QUANTITY	COST	With 50% Contingenci	With 40% Admin	Walkway Unit Cost
Scenario A - Construct 6.5-foot wide sidewalk, curb, gutter and storm drainage on one side (where only shoulders exist).								
1	Mobilization (10%)	LS	\$5,400	1.00	\$5,400			
2	Surveying (5%)	LS	\$2,700	1.00	\$2,700			
3	Curb and Gutter	LF	\$24	200.00	\$4,800			
4	Sidewalk PCC	SF	\$7	1,300.00	\$9,100			
5	4" Asphalt/5" ATB (4' Wide Patch)	SF	\$9	800.00	\$7,200			
6	Sawcut Pavement	LF	\$5	200.00	\$1,000			
7	Pavement Removal	SF	\$5	800.00	\$4,000			
8	Stormfilter Catch Basin Type 1 (Media Filter) w/Maint (2/200 LF)	EA	\$3,500	2.00	\$7,000			
9	12" Conc. SD inclu. excavation, placement and backfill	LF	\$70	150.00	\$10,500			
10	ADA Ramps	EA	\$1,800	2.00	\$3,600			
11	Clearing & Grubbing	LS	\$2,000	1.00	\$2,000			
12	Street Trees (1 every 40 feet @ \$500 EA)	EA	\$500	4.00	\$2,000			
13	Irrigation System	LS	\$2,500	1.00	\$2,500			
14	Temporary Erosion & Sediment Control	LS	\$500	1.00	\$500			
15	Traffic Control (2 flaggers for 8 HR @ \$60/HR)	LS	\$1,000	1.00	\$1,000			
					\$63,300	\$94,950	\$132,930	\$700
Scenario B - Construct 6.5-foot wide sidewalk, curb and gutter on one side (where shoulder and storm drainage exist).								
1	Mobilization (10%)	LS	\$3,600	1.00	\$3,600			
2	Surveying (5%)	LS	\$1,800	1.00	\$1,800			
3	Curb and Gutter	LF	\$24	200.00	\$4,800			
4	Sidewalk PCC	SF	\$7	1,300.00	\$9,100			
5	4" Asphalt/5" ATB (4' Wide Patch)	SF	\$9	800.00	\$7,200			
6	Sawcut Pavement	LF	\$5	200.00	\$1,000			
7	Pavement Removal	SF	\$5	800.00	\$4,000			
8	ADA Ramps	EA	\$1,800	2.00	\$3,600			
9	Clearing & Grubbing	LS	\$2,000	1.00	\$2,000			
10	Street Trees (1 every 40 feet @ \$500 EA)	EA	\$500	4.00	\$2,000			
11	Irrigation System	LS	\$2,500	1.00	\$2,500			
12	Temporary Erosion & Sediment Control	LS	\$500	1.00	\$500			
13	Traffic Control (2 flaggers for 8 HR @ \$60/HR)	LS	\$1,000	1.00	\$1,000			
					\$43,100	\$64,650	\$90,510	\$500
Scenario C - Construct 6.5-foot wide sidewalk on one side (where curb, gutters and storm drainage exist).								
1	Mobilization (10%)	LS	\$2,600	1.00	\$2,600			
2	Surveying (5%)	LS	\$1,300	1.00	\$1,300			
3	Sidewalk PCC	SF	\$7	1,300.00	\$9,100			
4	4" Asphalt/5" ATB (4' wide Patch)	SF	\$9	400.00	\$3,600			
5	Sawcut Pavement	LF	\$5	200.00	\$1,000			
6	Pavement Removal	SF	\$5	400.00	\$2,000			
7	ADA Ramps	EA	\$1,800	2.00	\$3,600			
8	Clearing & Grubbing	LS	\$2,000	1.00	\$2,000			
9	Street Trees (1 every 40 feet @ \$500 EA)	EA	\$500	4.00	\$2,000			
10	Imigation System	LS	\$2,500	1.00	\$2,500			
11	Temporary Erosion & Sediment Control	LS	\$500	1.00	\$500			
12	Traffic Control (2 flaggers for 8 HR @ \$60/HR)	LS	\$1,000	1.00	\$1,000			
					\$31,200	\$46,800	\$65,520	\$400

Note: The above scenarios do not account for the additional 1.5' sidewalk width, utility undergrounding, and pedestrian illumination that would be required in the City's Downtown.

Attachment D

Table 1. Funding Sources

GRANT SOURCE	AGENCY	MATCHING REQUIREMENTS	ELEGIBLE PROJECTS						DESCRIPTION	CONTACT OR WEBSITE	
			Acquisition	Planning	Design	Construction	Education	Maintenance			
FEDERAL FUNDING											
Surface Transportation Program (STP)	Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC)	20%	√	√	√	√	√	√	Flexible funding that may be used by states and localities for projects to preserve and improve the transportation system consistent with regional priorities.	http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/localprograms/ProgramMgmt/STP.htm	
Federal Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)	WSDOT – City Safety Program	10%		√	√	√	√		The goal of the program is to reduce fatal and serious injury collisions.	Traffic Services Branch Manager, Susan Bowe, PE, 360-705-7380, BoweS@wsdot.wa.gov	
Railway-Highway Crossing Program (RHC)	WSDOT – City Safety Program	10% depending on project		√	√	√			These funds are designated for improvements to highway-rail grade crossings to eliminate safety hazards.	Traffic Services Branch Manager, Susan Bowe, PE, 360-705-7380, BoweS@wsdot.wa.gov	
Safe Routes to School	WSDOT	0% required, match preferred		√	√	√	√		Enable and encourage children to walk and bicycle to school. Funding from this program is for projects within two-miles of primary and middle schools.	http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/LocalPrograms/SafeRoutes/funding.htm	
Community Development Block Grants	HUD	N/A	√				√	√	Primarily for community revitalization, may be used to fund streetscape improvements.	http://www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/communitydevelopment/programs/index.cfm	
Transportation, Community, and System Preservation Program (TCSP)	FHWA	20%		√	√				Provides federal funding for transit-oriented development, traffic calming and other projects that improve the efficiency of the transportation system, reduce the impact on the environment, and provide efficient access to jobs, services, and trade centers.	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tcsp/ http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/discretionary/tcsp2012info.htm	
Federal Lands Highway Funds	Federal Highway Administration	11%	√	√	√	√	√	√	Eligible projects must appear in State Transportation Improvement Program.	Contact Washington Division, Federal Highway Administration http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/wadiv/	
STATE FUNDING											
Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Program	WSDOT	0% required, match preferred		√	√	√	√		Grants to support pedestrian and bicycle safety projects such as shared-use paths, sidewalks, safe routes to school and transit. Invited agencies only.	Kathleen Davis, H&L Director, 360-705-7871 http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/bike/Funding.htm	
Transportation Improvement Board (TIB) Sidewalk, Urban Arterials and Urban Corridors Program	TIB	20%			√	√			Grant funding generated by statewide gas tax. State grant funding for arterials, sidewalks, and safety measures.	http://www.tib.wa.gov/grants/urban/SP.cfm	
LOCAL FUNDING											
Real Estate Excise Tax (REET)	King County	N/A			√	√			REET funding can be used for limited types of transportation projects.	http://www.kingcounty.gov/business/Forecasting/Forecasts/REET.aspx	

LOCAL FUNDING (CONTINUED)

Transportation Benefit District (TBD)	City of Kenmore	N/A			√	√	√	In 2012, the City Council created a TBD and the TBD approved a \$20 vehicle registration fee within the Kenmore City Limits to pay for transportation improvements. Projects include annual street repaving and the installation of sidewalks, ramps, and pedestrian crossings within the City of Kenmore.	http://www.kenmorewa.gov/Page.aspx?cid=3045
Developer Delay of Street Improvement Agreements or Fee-in-Lieu Sidewalk Contributions	City of Kenmore	N/A			√	√	√	Developers may be directed by the City to enter into a delay of street improvement agreement or pay a fee in lieu of constructing frontage improvements if site conditions warrant or if a future City project is planned in the area.	
Traffic Impact Fees	City of Kenmore	N/A			√	√		Traffic impact fees may be used to fund projects in the City's Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element.	http://www.kenmorewa.gov/Page.aspx?cid=1146

Attachment E

CITY OF KENMORE, WASHINGTON T 27 SIDEWALK PROGRAM FOR THE YEARS 2013-2018

Project Description	2013 Proposed	2014 Proposed	2015 Proposed	2016 Proposed	2017 Proposed	2018 Proposed	2013-2018 Totals
T 27-1 East Side of 68th Ave NE from 182nd to 185th ST	\$237,942						\$237,942
T 27-2 North Side of 155th ST from 84th to 86th Ave		\$487,000					\$487,000
T 27-3 South Side of 181st ST from 68th to 73rd Ave			\$347,500				\$347,500
T 27-4 West Side of 68th Ave/202nd ST from 198th ST to 66th Ave				\$144,000	\$576,000		\$720,000
T 27-5 West Side of Arrowhead Drive from 64th Ave to 151st ST					\$100,000	\$400,000	\$500,000
Total Project Costs	\$237,942	\$487,000	\$347,500	\$144,000	\$676,000	\$400,000	\$2,292,442
Remaining Fund Balance at Year's End	\$115,465	\$69,365	\$65,115	\$525,115	\$299,115	-\$885	
Funding:							
Real Estate Excise Tax - Set Aside Sidewalks	\$174,950	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$674,950
Secured State/TIB	\$178,457						178,457
Unsecured State/TIB				504,000			504,000
Unsecured WSDOT Pedestrian and Bicycle Program		340,900					340,900
Unsecured WSDOT Safe Routes to Schools					350,000		350,000
Unsecured King County Community Development Block Grants			243,250				243,250
Total Project Funding	\$353,407	\$440,900	\$343,250	\$604,000	\$450,000	\$100,000	\$2,291,557

City contributions to sidewalk projects assume 25% matching funds and 5% upfront grant preparation and staff administration costs.



Legend

- | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|--|-----------|--|---------|
| | City Boundary | | Parks | | Schools |
| | Streets | | City Hall | | Library |
| | Streams | | Library | | |

This map is intended for planning purposes only and is not guaranteed to show accurate measurements.

Attachment F 2013-18 SIDEWALK IMPLEMENTATION PLAN VICINITY MAP

0 1,250 2,500 5,000 Feet

